



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO.

09/222,460

Г

12/29/98

HAMMERMAN

M

DATE MAILED:

A-64236-3-RF

EXAMINER

HM22/0916

FLEHR HOHBACH TEST ALBRITTON & HERBERT SUITE 3400 FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4187

MOEZIE, F ART UNIT 1654

PAPER NUMBER 09/16/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Applicant(s) Application No. 09/222,460

Hammerman etal

	Administration of the second o
	F.T. Moesie 1654
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO E OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	(PIREMONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, exp Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, 	re SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this continunication.
Status	100
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/29	78
This action is FINAL.	
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 (ormal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims	
Ø Claim(s) 1 — []	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
☐ Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
□ Claim(s)	
Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
∑ Claim(s)	are subject to restriction of election requirement.
Application Papers	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing I	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objecte	to by the Examiner.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)	
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority und □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of th □ received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number □ received in this national stage application from the International 	priority documents have been
*Certified copies not received:	•
Attachment(s)	Distantian Surrence PTO 412
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No	s) Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-15
☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892	
□ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	Other

Office Action Summary

Serial Number: 09/222,460

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method for the treatment of metanephric tissue using polypeptide growth factors, classified in class 514, subclass 12, for example.
- II. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method for the treatment of metanephric tissue using transferrin-a glycopeptide, classified in class 514, subclass 8, for example.
- III. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method for the treatment of metanephric tissue using prostaglandin E1, classified in class 514, subclass 573, for example.
- IV. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method for the treatment of metanephric tissue using Na selenite-an inorganic salt, classified in class 423, subclass 509, for example.
- V. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method for the treatment of metanephric tissue using vitamin A, classified in class 568, subclass 824, for example.

The inventions are distinct because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II, III, IV, or V are distinct from one another. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions, different modes of operation. The

Serial Number: 09/222,460 Page 3

Art Unit: 1654

inventions are distinct because of their different structures and properties; hence they are capable of separate use.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In the event applicant elects Group I invention, applicant is further required to elect a specie of growth factor as indicated herein below.

ELECTION OF SPECIE

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: GH, IGF-II, IGF-II, TGF-alpha, TGF-beta, VEGF and NGF.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-9 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations

Serial Number: 09/222,460 Page 4

Art Unit: 1654

of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner F.T. Moezie whose telephone number is (703) 305-4508 or Mr. Woodward (SPE) at 308-4028.

PINIARY EXAMIN